arXiv:1510.06997v1 [math.DS] 23 Oct 2015

A strategic algorithmic tool for doing an *a priori* identifiability study of dynamical nonlinear models.

October 26, 2015

N. Verdière[1] and S. Orange[1]

Abstract

The identifiability's study of a parametrized model is one of the last step of the modeling and consists in insuring that each of its output corresponds to a unique parameter vector. Actually, at our knowledge, no concrete solution or automatic procedure has been proposed in the literature in the case of a non identifiable model. This paper proposes to go further in the identifiability results through the definition of *relative identifiability* that is the determination of the identifiability of any parameter relatively to any set of parameters. We propose an algorithm in order to determine the relative identifiability of any parameter relatively to any list of other parameters. This algorithm takes into account some eventual constraints satisfied by parameters and by its output(s) through the consideration of the initial conditions of the system. It can help an experimenter to elaborate strategies about key parameters that should be estimated and eventually outputs or constraints on parameters that must be added to obtain the identifiability of the model. Three applications of this algorithm are presented to show the relevance of the suggested approach.

Keywords : Parameters' Identifiability, Relative identifiability; Nonlinear models; Algorithm

1 Introduction

When a new model is developed, some parameters are not directly accessible from the experiments. For evaluating them, the experimenter can put in place some numerical procedures using experimental datas, for example minimal least-squares which consists in minimizing output vector(s) produced

[1] Normandie Univ, France; ULH, LMAH, F-76600 Le Havre; FR CNRS 3335, ISCN, 25 rue Philippe Lebon 76600 Le Havre, France
(Corresponding authors: Nathalie.Verdiere@univ-lehavre.fr, Sebastien.Orange@univ-lehavre.fr)

by the model with the measured data vector(s). However, if some parameters are not identifiable, that is two or several values of parameters give the same solution of the model, in particular the same output(s), the numerical procedure can fail or can give a local minimum eventually corresponding to unrealistic parameters. The experimenter gropes then for adding informations on the model, for example in restricting the definition domain of the parameters or in considering one more measured variable, i.e. another output for the model. In fact, this work consists in obtaining the identifiability of the unknown parameters in order to guarantee that output(s) correspond(s) exactly to one parameter vector or in other words, to establish the injectivity of the function which associates to parameter vector, the vector formed of the corresponding output(s).

This paper proposes an algorithm which can help the user in its decisions for obtaining such property. For doing this, we introduce the notion of identifiability relatively to a set of parameters, that is identifiability of a given parameter when some other parameters are known. From this definition, we propose an algorithm, named `RelativeIdentifiabilityTree` which returns a set of lists of parameters. From this list, it is possible to determine the identifiability of any given parameter if some other parameters become identifiable. Our algorithm can take into account the definition domain of the parameters and, possibly, some algebraic relations between then such as initial conditions which can have an important role in the identifiability property (See [8], [18], [20]).

Several definitions and methods for checking the identifiability of linear and nonlinear systems can be found in the literature. For studying such a property, one can use, for example, the Taylor Series approach of [16] based on the analysis of a power series expansion of the output which gives rise to an algebraic system constituted of an infinite number of equations. However, this method leads to complex systems essentially in the case of nonlinear systems and generally yields local identifiability results. A second method is based on the local state isomorphism theorem (See [5], [8], [6], [22]). It leads to study the solution of a specific set of partial differential equations [7].
A third method is based on differential algebra and was introduced in [10], [12], [13] and [15]. The considered nonlinear dynamical parametrized models (controlled or uncontrolled) are of the following form:

$$\Gamma^{\Theta} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{x}(t,\Theta) = g(x(t,\Theta), u(t), \Theta), \\ y(t,\Theta) = h(x(t,\Theta), u(t), \Theta), \end{array} \right. \tag{1}$$

where:

- $x(t,\Theta) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y(t,\Theta) \in \mathbb{R}^s$ denotes the state variables and the outputs respectively,

- the functions g and h are real, rational and analytic on M, where M is an open set of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x(t, \Theta) \in M$ for every $t \in [t_0,\ T]$. T is a finite or infinite time bound,
- $u(t) \in R^r$ is the control vector,
- the vector of parameters $\Theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m)$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}_\Theta$, where $\mathcal{U}_\Theta$ is an a priori known set of admissible parameters; $\mathcal{U}_\Theta$ is either included in $\mathbb{R}^m$ or equal to $\mathbb{R}^m$.

From the Rosenfeld-Groebner algorithm which provides an elimination algorithm, relations linking outputs, inputs and unknown parameters of the system can be obtained. These relations are called *input-output polynomials*. In the original version of the identifiability's definition, initial conditions are ignored. However, identifiability, without any consideration of initial conditions, does not imply identifiability with initial conditions (See [1]). A few developments are proposed in order to consider them (See [18], [8], [20]).

Most of these methods imply to study the injectivity of a real function. In this paper, we are interested in the last method. Indeed, this method can be applied to linear or nonlinear models and in [9], an equivalence is given between the identifiability result and the injectivity of the function formed of the coefficients of the input-output polynomials. This equivalence insures that the set of lists provided by our algorithm is exhaustive for the considered model.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the identifiability's definition and the method based on differential algebra for studying it are recalled. In Section 3, the notion of identifiability relatively to a subset of parameters is presented. In this same section, we present an algorithm returning some lists of parameters from which it is possible to determine the identifiability of any parameter relatively to any set of parameters. In order to illustrate our algorithm, three examples are treated at Section 4. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 From model to the exhaustive summary

In [13], the authors have proposed definitions of identifiability in the framework of algebra and one of them is recalled below. If the initial conditions are not considered in (1), the solution may not be unique and some solutions might be degenerated. Thus, the set of outputs corresponding to the set of non-degenerated solutions is denoted $Y(\Theta, u)$.

Definition 1. *Γ^Θ is said to be globally identifiable at $\tilde{\Theta}$ relatively to $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{P}$ if there exists an input signal u^* such that $Y(\tilde{\Theta}, u^*) \neq \emptyset$ and*

$$Y(\tilde{\Theta}, u^*) \cap Y(\Theta, u^*) \neq \emptyset,\ \Theta \in \mathcal{D}_\mathcal{M} \Rightarrow \tilde{\Theta} = \Theta.$$

Thus, the model Γ^{Θ} is globally identifiable if the set of outputs generated by $\tilde{\Theta}$ has an empty intersection with those generated by $\Theta \neq \tilde{\Theta}$. In the same way, a local definition has been proposed.
Notice that, in the case of known initial conditions, Model Γ^{Θ} has a unique solution and identifiability definition comes back to seek this property on unique outputs and not on a set of outputs. Definition 1 takes also the following form:

Definition 2. *The parameter θ_i will be said globally identifiable if there exists an input signal u^* such that for any $(\tilde{\Theta}, \hat{\Theta}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{M}}$, $\tilde{\theta}_i \neq \hat{\theta}_i$, the systems $\Gamma^{\tilde{\Theta}}$ and $\Gamma^{\hat{\Theta}}$ yield different outputs.*
The model Γ^{Θ} is globally identifiable if all parameters θ_i are globally identifiable.

The first step of this method consists in eliminating unobservable state variables in order to get relations between inputs, outputs and parameters. For doing this, the system Γ^{θ} is rewritten as a differential polynomial system completed with equalities $\dot{\theta}_i = 0$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m)$. The following system composed of polynomial equations and inequalities is then obtained:

$$\Gamma \begin{cases} p(\dot{x}, x, u, \Theta) = 0, \\ q(x, y, \Theta) = 0, \\ r(x, y, \Theta) \neq 0, \\ \dot{\theta}_i = 0 \ (i = 1, \ldots, m). \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Let us introduce some notations:

- $\mathcal{I}$ is the radical of the differential ideal generated by (2). $\mathcal{I}$, endowed with the following ranking which eliminates the state variables:

$$[\Theta] \prec [y, u] \prec [x]\,, \tag{3}$$

  is assumed to admit a characteristic presentation $\mathcal{C}$ (i.e. a canonical representant of the ideal) which has the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\theta}_1, \ldots, \dot{\theta}_p, \\ P_1(y, u, \Theta), \ldots, P_s(y, u, \Theta), \\ Q_1(y, u, \Theta, x), \ldots, Q_n(y, u, \Theta, x)\,. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

  $\mathcal{C}(\Theta)$ will denote the particular characteristic presentation $\mathcal{C}$ evaluated in Θ.

- $\mathcal{I}_{\Theta}$ is the radical of the differential ideal generated by (2) for the particular value of parameter Θ and $\mathcal{C}_{\Theta}$ is the characteristic presentation associated with the ranking $[y, u] \prec [x]$.

- Finally, $\mathcal{I}_\Theta^{i_0}$ is the ideal obtained after eliminating state variables and the set $\mathcal{C}_\Theta^{i_0} = \mathcal{C}_\Theta \cap \mathbb{Q}(\Theta)\{U, Y\}$ is a characteristic presentation of this ideal.

The following proposition gives a necessary and sufficient condition for having the global identifiability.

Proposition 1. *If the system* Γ *does not admit non generic solution then the model is globally identifiable if and only if for all* $\tilde{\Theta} \in \mathcal{U}_p$,

$$\mathcal{C}_\Theta^{i_0} = \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{i_0} \Rightarrow \Theta = \tilde{\Theta}.$$

This proposition is difficult to verify since the initial system would have to be evaluated in every parameter value as the associated characteristic presentation $\mathcal{C}_\Theta^{i_0}$. The authors in [9] have given some technical conditions in order to have the equality $\mathcal{C}_\Theta = \mathcal{C}(\Theta)$. These assumptions are

(A_1) the initial of P_i (resp. Q_i), that is the coefficient of the highest derivative at the highest power is not equal to zero,

(A_2) if $\mathcal{N}$ denotes the other derivatives and $K[\mathcal{N}]$ the polynomial ring built over $\mathcal{N}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{R}$, then none of the factors ($\neq 1$) of the initial of $c_i(\theta)$ is a divisor of all the other coefficients of $P_i \in K[\mathcal{N}]$ (resp. $Q_i \in K[\mathcal{N}]$).

Under these conditions, the characteristic presentation $\mathcal{C}_\Theta$, that is, $\mathcal{C}_\Theta^{i_0}$ of $\mathcal{I}_\theta^{i_0}$ is proved to contain the differential polynomials $P_1(y, u, \Theta), \ldots, P_s(y, u, \Theta)$ which can be expressed as

$$P_i(y, u, \theta) = \gamma_0^i(y, u) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} c_{i,k}(\Theta) m_{k,i}(y, u) \tag{5}$$

where $(c_{i,k}(\Theta))_{1 \leq k \leq n_i}$ are rational in Θ, $\gamma_u^i \neq \gamma_v^i$ $(u \neq v)$, $(m_{k,i}(y, u))_{1 \leq k \leq n_i}$ are differential polynomials relatively to y and u and $\gamma_0^i \neq 0$.

The size of the system is the number of observations.
The identifiability analysis is based on the following proposition (see [9]).

Proposition 2. *If, for all* $i = 1, \ldots, s$, *the determinant*

$$\triangle P_i(y, u, \Theta) = \det(m_{k,i}(y, u), k = 1, \ldots, n_i)$$

is not identically equal to zero, then Γ^Θ *is globally identifiable at* Θ *if and only if for every* $\tilde{\Theta} \in \mathcal{U}_p$ *(*$\tilde{\Theta} \neq \Theta$*), the characteristic presentations* $\mathcal{C}_\Theta^{i_0}$ *and* $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{i_0}$ *are distinct.*

In particular, one gets the useful proposition:

Proposition 3. *If, for all $i = 1, \ldots, s$, the determinant*

$$\triangle P_i(y, u, \Theta) = \det(m_{k,i}(y, u), k = 1, \ldots, n_i)$$

is not identically equal to zero and no separant or initial of P_i, $i = 1, \ldots, s$ and Q_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$ is zero then

$$\forall \tilde{\Theta},\, \mathcal{C}_{\Theta}^{i_0} = \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\Theta}}^{i_0} \;\Leftrightarrow\; \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}, \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n_i\},\; c_{i,j}(\Theta) = c_{i,j}(\tilde{\Theta})\,.$$

Consequently,proving the identifiability of the model is equivalent to verify the injectivity of the function $\phi : \Theta \mapsto (c_{i,j}(\Theta))_{1 \leq i \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq n_i}$.

Definition 3. *The exhaustive summary is the sequence $(c_{i,j}(\Theta))_{1 \leq i \leq s,\, 1 \leq j \leq n_i}$.*

Remark 1. *In order to prove that the determinant of Proposition 3 is not identically equal to 0, it is sufficient to verify the linear independence of the $m_{k,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u})$ $(k = 1, \ldots, s_i)$. This can be done by computing the functional determinant given by the Wronskian (See [8])*

$$\triangle\, w_{1,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u}) = \begin{vmatrix} m_{1,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u}) & \ldots & m_{s_i,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u}) \\ m_{1,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u})^{(1)} & \ldots & m_{s_i,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u})^{(1)} \\ & \ddots & \\ m_{1,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u})^{(s_i-1)} & \ldots & m_{s_i,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u})^{(s_i-1)} \end{vmatrix} \tag{6}$$

and by verifying that $\triangle w_{1,i}(\bar{y}, \bar{u})$ is not identically equal to zero. In the framework of differential algebra, this condition consists in testing that this functional determinant is not in the ideal obtained after eliminating state variables. In practice, it can be done with the function `BelongsTo` *of the package* `DifferentialAlgebra` *of Maple 18. Note that, if there exists a time point at which this Wronskian vanishes, this condition is satisfied (See [9]).*

The functions `Initial` *and* `Separant` *of the last package enables us the verification of the other assumptions of Proposition 3.*

Example 1. *Consider the following model useful for illustrating the theoretical notions introduced afterwards:*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = \theta_1 x_2 - (\theta_4 + \theta_3) x_1^2 + u, \\ \dot{x}_2 = \theta_4 x_1^2 - \theta_1 x_2 - \theta_2 x_2, \\ y = x_1 \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

where the parameters are positive reals.

In using the differential algebra, the following input-output polynomial is obtained:

$$\begin{array}{l} y^{(3)} - \dot{u} + (\theta_2 + \theta_1)\,(\ddot{y} - u) \\ +(\theta_3\theta_2 + \theta_3\theta_1 + \theta_2\theta_4)\,\dot{y}^2 + 2(\theta_3 + \theta_4)\,\ddot{y}\,\dot{y} = 0. \end{array} \tag{8}$$

In that case, the exhaustive summary is equal to $(\theta_2 + \theta_1, \theta_3\theta_2 + \theta_3\theta_1 + \theta_2\theta_4, \theta_3 + \theta_4)$ *and the function* ϕ *is defined by:* $\phi : \Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4) \to (\theta_2 + \theta_1, \theta_3\theta_2 + \theta_3\theta_1 + \theta_2\theta_4, \theta_3 + \theta_4)$.
Clearly, ϕ *is not injective and the model is not globally identifiable.*

Proposition 3 shows that studying identifiability of a model consists in showing that the nonlinear algebraic system $\phi(\Theta) = \phi(\tilde{\Theta})$ implies equality $\Theta = \tilde{\Theta}$.
Several strategies had been proposed in the literature. For example, in [9] and [20], Groebner basis algorithms are used to solve this real system but this may not succeed. In [3] and [19], the authors take some particular values of $\phi(\Theta)$ and, consequently, reduce the identifiability study to a local one. In both methods, the definition domain of ϕ are not considered through an automatic procedure. In the following section, we propose another approach taking into account this kind of informations. For doing this, we introduce the definition of relative identifiability which leads to obtain lists indicating what are the keys parameters giving the global identifiability of the model.

3 From Exhaustive summary to relative identifiability

3.1 Relative identifiability

In numerical applications, the model's parameters are submitted to some constraints as, for example, a rate of birth that must be positive. Afterwards, all these conditions are denoted C and consist in a sequence of equalities or inequalities verified by the parameters.
Consider $\Theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m)$ and $\tilde{\Theta} = (\tilde{\theta}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\theta}_m)$ two m-tuple of real indeterminates. Let us set

$$S \begin{cases} \Theta \text{ and } \tilde{\Theta} \text{ verify Conditions } C \\ \phi(\Theta) = \phi(\tilde{\Theta}) \end{cases}$$

and

$$S_{\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}} \begin{cases} \Theta \text{ and } \tilde{\Theta} \text{ verify Conditions } C \\ (\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}) = (\tilde{\theta}_{a_1}, \ldots, \tilde{\theta}_{a_r}) \\ \phi(\Theta) = \phi(\tilde{\Theta})\,. \end{cases}$$

Recall that ϕ is the function which, to the parameter vector Θ, associates the coefficients of the input-output polynomial (See Section 2). Thus, equations

of S and $S_{\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}}$ are polynomial or rational expressions of parameters. In particular, if conditions C imply that denominators of the third equation does not vanish, this last equation leads to a polynomial system.
If initial conditions are incorporated in C and System S implies that $\theta_{a_i} = \tilde{\theta}_{a_i}$we recover Definition 2 of identifiability, that is the parameter θ_i is identifiable. In the following definition, we propose to extend the identifiability of parameters relatively to System S.

Definition 4. *The parameter $\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ is said to be identifiable relatively to the parameters $\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}$ if System $S_{\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}}$ implies that $\theta_{a_{r+1}} = \tilde{\theta}_{a_{r+1}}$.*

Thereafter, this paper deals with the relative identifiability study of System S that is the determination of the relative identifiability of any parameter relatively to any set of parameters taken among $\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_m$.

In order to determine if a given parameter is identifiable relatively to other parameters, the following proposition uses the classical tool of computer algebra techniques called the Rabinowitsch trick (See [17]) and it can be seen as a reformulation of Definition 4 in terms of real semi-algebraic sets, i.e. sets of real solutions of polynomial equations and/or inequations (See [2]).

Proposition 4. *Let $(\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_m)$ and $(\tilde{\theta}_1,\ldots,\tilde{\theta}_m)$ be two m-tuple of real undeterminates. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *the parameter $\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ of System S is identifiable relatively to the parameters $\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}$;*
2. *the set of solutions of $S_{\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}} \cup \left\{v\left(\theta_{a_{r+1}} - \tilde{\theta}_{a_{r+1}}\right) - 1 = 0\right\}$, where v is a new variable, is empty.*

Remark 2. *The classical identifiability (Definition 1) can be tested using this proposition. Indeed, proving the identifiability of the parameter $\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ is equivalent to prove that System S completed with $\left\{v\left(\theta_{a_{r+1}} - \tilde{\theta}_{a_{r+1}}\right) - 1 = 0\right\}$ has no real solution.*

This proposition brings the relative identifiability problem to the problem consisting in testing if semi-algebraic set is empty. For the applications presented in Section 4, the function `IsEmpty` of the Maple package `SemiAlgebraicSetTools` is used to test relative identifiability. For the following example, we use the function `HasRealSolution` of the Maple package Raglib (See [11]). These functions take as input a semi-algebraic system with

rational coefficients and returns an empty list if the input semi-algebraic system has no solution. The problem of emptiness of a semi algebraic set can also be solved by some other computer algebra tools (See [23, 4], for example).

Remark 3. *Equations appearing in Proposition 4 are stable under the symmetry exchanging parameters θ_i and $\tilde{\theta}_i$, it would be interesting to use this stability to improve the efficiency of Algorithm 1. To our knowledge, there is no package using this propriety.*

Example 2. *In Example 1, the function ϕ is defined by*

$$\phi(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4) = (\theta_2 + \theta_1, \theta_3\theta_2 + \theta_3\theta_1 + \theta_2\theta_4, \theta_3 + \theta_4)\,.$$

Suppose that the set of Conditions C is equal to $\{\theta_4 > 0, \tilde{\theta}_4 > 0\}$ and consider the following System S:

$$S \quad \begin{cases} \theta \text{ and } \tilde{\theta} \text{ verify Conditions } C \\ \phi(\Theta) = \phi(\tilde{\Theta}) \end{cases}$$

In order to determine whether the parameter θ_1 is identifiable, we use the function `HasRealSolution` *of the Raglib package with inputs the system $S \cup \{v(\theta_1 - \tilde{\theta}_1) - 1 = 0\}$ and the set of variables $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3, \tilde{\theta}_4\}$. Since the output of this function is a non empty list, in other words, the semi-algebraic system has some real solutions, we conclude that θ_1 is not identifiable from System S.*

For the identifiability of θ_4 relatively to the parameter θ_1, consider System S_{θ_1}, that is S completed with $\{\tilde{\theta}_1 = \theta_1\}$. In order to apply Proposition 4, we add to this system the equation $v(\theta_4 - \tilde{\theta}_4) - 1 = 0$. This set of polynomial equations and inequations and the set of variables $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2, \tilde{\theta}_3, \tilde{\theta}_4, v\}$ are the inputs of the function `HasRealSolution` *of the Raglib package. The obtained output is a non empty list. Therefore, from Proposition 4, we deduce that θ_4 is not identifiable relatively to $\{\theta_1\}$.*

In order to determine whether the parameter θ_3 is identifiable relatively to the parameters θ_1 and θ_4, the system S_{θ_1,θ_4}, that is S completed with $\{\tilde{\theta}_1 = \theta_1, \tilde{\theta}_4 = \theta_4\}$. In order to apply Proposition 4, we add to this system the equation $v(\theta_3 - \tilde{\theta}_3) - 1 = 0$. The function `HasRealSolution` *applied to this last system returns the empty set; therefore Proposition 4 shows that θ_3 is identifiable relatively to $\{\theta_1, \theta_4\}$.*

Remark 4. *The set of conditions C plays an important role for (relative) identifiability. In this last example, if the set of conditions C is considered, the parameter θ_3 is identifiable relatively to $\{\theta_1, \theta_4\}$ but this is not the case without this set of conditions.*

3.2 Computation of the relative identifiability of all the parameters

In order to determine the identifiability of each parameter relatively to any other set of parameters, a straightforward and naive approach consists in constructing all the possible sequences $[\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}]$ of r parameters ($1 \leq r \leq m-1$) and in testing the identifiability of any other parameter relatively to $\{\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}\}$ (See Proposition 4). This leads to a tree traversal algorithm in which any of the $m!$ nodes correspond to an emptiness tests of semi-algebraic sets. In practice, for a large number of parameters, such an approach can be inefficient because of the time needed for the tests.

In this section, we present an algorithm, Algorithm 1, based on this tree transversal avoiding some useless tests. For the construction of parameters list by this algorithm, let us set the following definition.

Definition 5. *Let $[\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}]$ be a list of $1 < r < m-1$ distinct elements of $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$. The empty list and any list $[\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_i}]$ ($1 \leq i \leq r-1$) are called prefix of $[\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}]$.*

In the same way, the empty list and any list $[\theta_{a_i}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}]$ ($2 \leq i \leq r$) are called suffix of $[\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}]$.

For example, if we consider the list $[\theta_1, \theta_4, \theta_3]$ of parameter taken among $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4\}$ then, $[\theta_1, \theta_4]$ is a prefix and $[\theta_4, \theta_3]$ a suffix of the list $[\theta_1, \theta_4, \theta_3]$.

In order to distinguish identifiable parameters to non identifiable ones in a list of parameters, we introduce the notation hereafter.

Notation 1. *Let $l = [\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}]$ be a list of r distinct elements of $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$.*

If the parameter θ_{a_1} is not identifiable, it will be written $\overline{\theta_{a_1}}$ in the list l. More generally, if θ_{a_i} ($2 \leq i \leq m$) is not identifiable relatively to $\{\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_{i-1}}\}$, we write it $\overline{\theta_{a_i}}$ in l.

Example 3. *The list of parameters $[\theta_1, \theta_4, \theta_3]$ in Example 2 is written $[\overline{\theta_1}, \overline{\theta_4}, \theta_3]$.*

In order to elaborate a recursive algorithm taken into account computations already done, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *Suppose that parameters $\theta_{b_1}, \ldots, \theta_{b_v}$ are identifiable relatively to an eventually empty list l of parameters then the parameter θ_{b_v} is identifiable relatively to the concatenated list*

$$l \texttt{ cat } [\theta_{b_1}, \ldots, \theta_{b_{v-1}}]$$

where `cat` *is the concatenation operator, which consists in joining the two lists end-to-end.*

This proposition is a direct consequence of Definition 4.

In terms of relative identifiability, using Notation 1, it means that one can permute identifiable parameters $\theta_{b_1}, \ldots, \theta_{b_v}$ in the list l `cat` $[\theta_{b_1}, \ldots, \theta_{b_v}]$ since it refers to the same information: parameters $\theta_{b_1}, \ldots, \theta_{b_v}$ are identifiable relatively to l. Consequently, from the algorithmic point of view, we need to compute only one of these list since the others can be determined by permutation of $\theta_{b_1}, \ldots, \theta_{b_v}$ in l `cat` $[\theta_{b_1}, \ldots, \theta_{b_v}]$.

The Algorithm 1 of this section uses the consequence of Proposition 5 to avoid unnecessary computations. It performs a tree transversal and returns a set of m-tuplet of $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$ from which it is possible to determine the identifiability of any parameter relatively to any subset of parameters. This set of m-tuplet, called the identifiability tree, is defined hereafter (See Definition 6).

Definition 6. *The identifiability tree of S is the set $\mathcal{T}$ of permutations of $[\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m]$ such that, for all $b \in \mathcal{T}$ and any prefix p of b, p is followed in b by an identifiable parameter relatively to p if there exists one.*

The fact that the relative identifiability of a parameter relatively to a prefix p does not depend on the order of the parameters in p but only on the set of parameters of p leads to the following proposition.

Proposition 6. *Let $b_1 = p_1$ `cat` s_1 be a branch of the identifiability tree $\mathcal{T}$ where p_1 is a prefix of b_1 and s_1 the corresponding suffix of p_1 in b. If p_2 is a permutation of p_1 then p_2 `cat` s_1 is also a branch of $\mathcal{T}$.*

In order to compute the identifiability tree $\mathcal{T}$, the latter proposition insures that, if the subtree $\mathcal{T}'$ of $\mathcal{T}$ of suffixes completing a given prefix p_1 is known, the subtree completing any prefix having the same parameters than p_1 do not have to be computed since it is also $\mathcal{T}'$. This leads naturally to a branch and cut technique to avoid some emptiness tests of semialgebraic sets and consequently the global cost of the computation of $\mathcal{T}$ which is due essentially to the cost of these tests.

The main function of Algorithm 1, called `RelativeIdentifiabilityTree`, takes as input the system S and returns the identifiability tree of S. In order

to avoid useless computations, the auxiliary function `CompletionWithComputedBranches` uses Proposition 6. Note that this proposition insures that the set $\mathcal{T}'$ returned by this function is a subset of the identifiability tree.

Algorithm 1.

Function `CompletionWithComputedBranches`*(l,$\mathcal{T}$);*
. */* Inputs: .A set $\mathcal{T}$ of branches of the identifiability tree*
. *.A list l of parameters taken among $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$ */*
. */* Outputs: .A boolean* `HasBeenCompleted` *equal to* `True` *if the sets of parameters of l and of*
. *one prefix of at least one element of $\mathcal{T}$ are equal ;* `False` *otherwise.*
. *. The set $\mathcal{T}'$ containing $\mathcal{T}$ and all the branches of the form l* `cat` *s where s is*
. *the suffix of a branch of $\mathcal{T}$ admitting as prefix a permutation of l. */*
. `HasBeenCompleted` *:=* `False`*;*
. *$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{T}$;*
. *For $l' \in \mathcal{T}$ do*
. . *If a permutation of a prefix of l' is equal to l then*
. . . *$l'' := l$* `cat` *$l'[Length(l)+1, \ldots, m]$;*
. . . *$\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{T}' \cup \{l''\}$;*
. . . `HasBeenCompleted` *:=* `True`*;*
. . *End If*
. *End For*
. *Return* [`HasBeenCompleted`; *$\mathcal{T}'$*]*;*
End Function ;

Function `RelativeIdentifiabilityTree`*(S, $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$);*
. */* Inputs: The system S and the set of all the parameters $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$ defined in Section 3.1 */*
. */* Output: The set of branches of the identifiability tree (See Definition 6) */*
. *l :=[];*
. *$\mathcal{T}$:= {[]};*
. *Return* `ConstructTheBranches`*(S, $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$, l, $\mathcal{T}$);*
End Function ;

Function `ConstructTheBranches`*(*$S, \{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}, l, \mathcal{T}$*);*

. */* Inputs: .the system S defined in Section 3.1*

. *.the set* $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$ *of parameters of system S*

. *.a tuplet l of* $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$

. *.a set of branches* $\mathcal{T}$ *of the identifiability tree*

. *Output: The set* $\mathcal{T}$ *of all the branches of the identifiability tree already computed and*

. *the one(s) admitting l as prefix*

. $SPP := \{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\} \setminus Set(l)$ *;*

. */*SPP is the set of possible parameters to complete the prefix l */*

. $hbc :=$ `False` *;*

. */*hbc is set to* `True` *when l is completed by function* `CompletionWithComputedBranches`**/*

. *If* $SPP \neq \emptyset$ *then*

. . *For* $\theta \in SPP$ *do*

. . . *If* $hbc =$ `False` *and* `SetOfRealSolutions`$(S \cup \{v * (\theta - \theta') = 0\}) = \emptyset$ *then*

. . . . */* The parameter* θ *is identifiable relatively to l (See Proposition 5) */*

. . . . $l := l$ *cat* $[\theta]$*;*

. . . . $[hbc, \mathcal{T}] :=$ `CompletionWithComputedBranches`*(l,*$\mathcal{T}$*);*

. . . . */* If Proposition 6 can be applied, l is completed with the branches of* $\mathcal{T}$ *already computed */*

. . . . $SPP := SPP \setminus \{\theta\}$*;*

. . . . $S := S \cup \{\theta = \theta'\}$*;*

. . . *End if*

. . *End for*

. *End If*

. . */* SPP contains now only non identifiable parameters relatively to l. */*

. *If* $SPP = \emptyset$ *then*

. . $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T} \cup \{l\}$

. *else*

. . *For* $\theta \in SPP$ *do*

. . */* Adjoining to* $\mathcal{T}$ *the set of branches admitting l cat* $[\bar{\theta}]$ *as prefix*/*

. . . $SPP := SPP \setminus \{\theta\}$*;*

. . . $[hbc, \mathcal{T}] :=$ `CompletionWithComputedBranches`*(* l *cat* $[\bar{\theta}]$ *,* $\mathcal{T}$ *);*

. . . *If* $hbc =$ `False` *then*

. . . . */* l cat* $[\bar{\theta}]$ *can not be completed with the branches of* $\mathcal{T}$ *already computed*/*

. . . . $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T} \cup$ `ConstructTheBranches`$(S \cup \{\theta = \theta'\}, \{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\},$ l *cat* $[\bar{\theta}], \mathcal{T})$*;*

. . . *End if*

. . *End for*

. *End If*

. *Return* $\mathcal{T}$*;*

End Function ;

This algorithm ends since it runs through a subtree of the tree of all the possible lists $[\theta_{a_1}, \ldots, \theta_{a_r}]$ of r parameters taken among $\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$.

At any recursive call of the function `ConstructTheBranches`, the prefix

l given as input is completed first with all the identifiable parameters relatively to l. This implies that any completed prefix added to the set $\mathcal{T}$ is a branch of the identifiability tree (See Definition 6).

Moreover, when function `CompletionWithComputedBranches` had completed l into branches of the identifiability tree, this function had used all the possible suffixes completing one permuted list of l into branches of $\mathcal{T}$. If $\mathcal{T}$ contains all the branches completing this permuted list into branches of the identifiability tree, it is also the case of l. Since each call of the function `ConstructTheBranches` returns all the branches of the identifiability tree completing the prefix given as input, the algorithm returns all the branches of the identifiability tree and is, therefore, correct.

Example 4. *Let us continue Example 1.*
Algorithm 1 applied to System S, constructed from this example, runs through the full tree of Figure 1, in which, for each node, an identifiability test of one parameter is done.



Figure 1: Tree transversal realised by Algorithm 1

Let us describe the computation of the identifiability tree realised by Algorithm 1.
Initially, the function `RelativeIdentifiabilityTree` *calls the recursive function* `ConstructTheBranches` *with, as input, the empty list* []. *This last function seeks for the identifiable parameters of the system. Since none of them are identifiable, successively, for each parameters* $\overline{\theta_1}, \ldots, \overline{\theta_m}$, *a recursive call is done to complete each prefix* $[\overline{\theta_i}]$ *(*$1 \leq i \leq 4$*). The first of these calls starts with the research of identifiable parameters relatively to* $[\theta_1]$ *in order to complete this prefix and this leads to* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2]$. *Parameters* θ_4 *and* θ_3 *being not identifiable relatively to* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2]$, *the function* `ConstructTheBranches` *is called to complete,*

1. *The prefix* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_3}]$. *Since* θ_4 *is identifiable relatively to this last prefix, the branch* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_3}, \theta_4]$ *is added to the empty set* $\mathcal{T}$.

2. *The prefix* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_4}]$. *Since* θ_3 *is identifiable relatively to this last prefix, the branch* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_4}, \theta_3]$ *is added to* $\mathcal{T}$.

Algorithm 1 continues the pre-order tree transversal of Tree 1 to complete the prefix $[\overline{\theta_2}]$. *Once the identifiability of* θ_1 *relatively to* $[\overline{\theta_2}]$ *has been tested, the branches of* $\mathcal{T}$ *already computed are used to complete* $[\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1]$ *into a branch of the identifiability tree. Since a prefix of* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_3}, \theta_4]$ *(resp.* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_4}, \theta_3]$*) is* $[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2]$, *the list* $[\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1]$ *is completed with the suffix of this branch and* $[\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1, \overline{\theta_3}, \theta_4]$ *(resp.* $[\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1, \overline{\theta_4}, \theta_3]$*) is adjoined to* $\mathcal{T}$ *by the auxiliary function* `CompletionWithComputedBranches`. *Notice that the boolean hbc in function* `ConstructTheBranches` *is then set to* `True` *and no emptiness test of semialgebraic set are done for completing* $[\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1]$ *into branches of the identifiability tree.*

Next, the algorithm runs through the two last branches of the tree and returns the set of all the branches of the identifiability tree:

$$\mathcal{T} = \left\{[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_3}, \theta_4], [\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \overline{\theta_4}, \theta_3], [\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1, \overline{\theta_3}, \theta_4], [\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1, \overline{\theta_4}, \theta_3], [\overline{\theta_3}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_4], [\overline{\theta_4}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3]\right\}$$

Many informations can be obtained from this output. For example, it shows that none of the parameters θ_1, θ_4, θ_3, θ_2 *of System* S *are identifiable. The two latest lists show also that if the value of* θ_3 *or* θ_4 *is known then the system is identifiable.*

Remark 5. *In this example, in order to illustrate the role of conditions* C, *notice that if all the parameters are supposed to be non negative, the algorithm returns*

$$\mathcal{T} = \left\{[\overline{\theta_1}, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4], [\overline{\theta_2}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_4], [\overline{\theta_3}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_4], [\overline{\theta_4}, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3]\right\} .$$

In this case, identifying only one parameter insures the identifiability of the other parameters.

Proposition 7 (Complexity)**.** *The number of emptiness tests of semi-algebraic sets performed by algorithm 1 is bounded by* $(2m - \nu + 1)2^{\nu-2}$ *where* m *is the number of parameters of System* S *and* ν *the maximum of non identifiable parameters appearing in the branches of* $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T}_r$ the set of prefixes of branches of $\mathcal{T}$ admitting r non identifiable parameters ($0 \leq r \leq \nu$) and $\mathcal{C}_r$ the subset of $\mathcal{T}_r$ composed of prefixes constructed by successive emptiness tests of semialgebraic sets.

For each prefix of $\mathcal{C}_r$ constructed by the algorithm, at least $r!$ prefixes of $\mathcal{T}_r$ are completed into branches of $\mathcal{T}$ using Proposition 6 that is without

any tests. Since there is at most $\nu(\nu-1)\cdots(\nu-(r-1))$ prefixes, up to a permutation of successive non identifiable parameters in these prefixes, $\mathcal{C}_r$ contains at most $\binom{\nu}{r}$ prefixes.

This implies that the number of tests needed for the non identifiable parameters appearing in the prefixes of $\mathcal{C}_r$ is bounded by $\binom{\nu}{r}$ and, consequently, that the number of tests performed by Algorithm for the determination of the non identifiable parameters is bounded by

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \binom{\nu}{r} = 2^{\nu}\,.$$

Moreover, since there are at most $m-r$ identifiable parameters in each prefix of $\mathcal{C}_r$, there are at most $(m-r)\binom{\nu}{r}$ tests performed for the identifiable parameters appearing in the prefixes of $\mathcal{C}_r$. This implies that the number of tests realised by Algorithm for the identifiable parameters is bounded by

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\nu}(m-r)\binom{\nu}{r} = (2m-\nu)2^{\nu-1}\,.$$

Therefore, the number of test realised by algorithm 1 for the determination of the identifiability tree is bounded by $(2m-\nu+2)2^{\nu-1}$. □

3.3 Identifiability of one parameter and identifiability tree

The following proposition shows that, from the identifiability tree $\mathcal{T}$, it is possible to determine the identifiability of a specific parameter $\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ relatively to a specific list of parameters $[\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}]$.

Proposition 8. *The parameter $\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ is identifiable relatively to $[\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}]$ if and only if there exists at least one branch $b\in\mathcal{T}$ of the form*

$$b = p \texttt{ cat } [\theta_{a_{r+1}}] \texttt{ cat } s$$

such that

- *$\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ is identifiable relatively to p;*
- *any non identifiable parameter appearing in p belongs to $\{\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}\}$.*

Proof. The condition is sufficient since, if $\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ is identifiable relatively to a subset of $\{\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}\}$, this parameter is also identifiable relatively to $[\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}]$.

Let us show that the condition is necessary. Let l be the list of non identifiable parameters appearing in the list $[\theta_{a_1},\ldots,\theta_{a_r}]$. If we consider the prefix l' of l of minimal length such that $\theta_{a_{r+1}}$ is identifiable, the list

$$l \texttt{ cat } [\theta_{a_{r+1}}]$$

is, by definition of the identifiability tree, a sublist of a branch of $\mathcal{T}$. Therefore, the second condition holds. □

3.4 Steps of the method

The step for studying relative identifiability are summed up below:

1. Elimination of unobservable state variables in order to get exhaustive summaries by using the Rosenfeld Grobner algorithm.
2. Verification of the Conditions of Proposition 3.
3. Construction of the set of conditions C with the hypothesis satisfied by parameters and taken eventually into account initial conditions.
4. From the exhaustive summary and the set of conditions C, construction of System S.
5. Computation of the relative identifiability tree using Algorithm 1.

4 Applications

In this section, the previous method is applied to three dynamical models. For each models, we precise the studied differential system, the outputs and the unknown parameters. Computations had been realised with the computer algebra software Maple. The exhaustif summary had been obtained with function `RosenfeldGrobner` of the package `DifferentialAlgebra` and, for testing the emptiness of semialgebraic systems, the function `IsEmpty` of package `RegularChains` had been used.

For each of the following examples, the assumptions of Proposition 3 had been verified (See Remark 1 for the technical tools).

4.1 A two degree of freedom mechanical system

In this example, we consider the mechanical system described by Figure 2 which shows two masses m_1 and m_2 free to move on the horizontal surface with three spring stiffness k_1, k_2 and k_3. In the following, we assume $m_1 > m_2$. Let x_1 and x_2 be the displacement of mass m_1 and m_2 respectively.

This system can be described by the following model:

$$\begin{cases} m_1\ddot{x}_1 + (k_1 + k_2)x_1 - k_2x_2 = 0 \\ m_2\ddot{x}_2 - k_2x_1 + (k_1 + k_3)x_2 = 0. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$



Figure 2: Mechanical system

Suppose that the outputs are of the following form:

$$y_1 = A_1 x_1,\ y_2 = B_1 x_2,$$

where A_1 and B_1 are known non-negative constants.

Let us assume that the experimenter wants to be insured the three spring stiffness k_i and the masses m_1 and m_2 can be identified from the outputs y_1 and y_2. In this objective, we study the relative identifiability of the unknown parameters k_1, k_2, k_3, m_1 and m_2.

In order to determine differential equations linking the outputs and the unknown parameters, the Groebner Rosenfeld algorithm is applied to system (9) with the elimination order $[A_1, B_1, k_1, k_2, k_3] \prec [y_1, y_2] \prec [x_1, x_2]$. This algorithm returns the following differential polynomials:

$$\begin{cases} -\dfrac{A_1 k_2}{B_1 m_1} y_2 + \dfrac{k_1 + k_2}{m_1} y_1 + \ddot{y}_1 = 0, \\ \dfrac{k_1 + k_3}{m_2} y_2 - \dfrac{B_1 k_2}{A_1 m_2} y_1 + \ddot{y}_2 = 0. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Therefore, the exhaustive summary is

$$\left(\frac{A_1 k_2}{B_1 m_1},\ \frac{k_1 + k_2}{m_1},\ \frac{k_1 + k_3}{m_2},\ \frac{B_1 k_2}{A_1 m_2} \right)$$

and the function ϕ in the case of this system is defined by

$$\phi(A_1,\ B_1,\ k_1,\ k_2,\ k_3) = \left(\frac{A_1 k_2}{B_1 m_1},\ \frac{k_1 + k_2}{m_1},\ \frac{k_1 + k_3}{m_2},\ \frac{B_1 k_2}{A_1 m_2} \right) .$$

The physical meaning of the parameters and the hypotheses about the masses lead to consider the set of conditions:

$$C = \{0 < A_1,\ 0 < B_1,\ 0 < k_1,\ 0 < k_2,\ 0 < k_3,\ 0 < m_1,\ 0 < m_2,\ 0 < \tilde{k}_1,\ 0 < \tilde{k}_2,$$
$$0 < \tilde{k}_3,\ 0 < \tilde{m}_1,\ 0 < \tilde{m}_2, m_1 < m_2,\ \tilde{m}_1 < \tilde{m}_2,\ A_1 = \tilde{A}_1,\ B_1 = \tilde{B}_1\} .$$

Algorithm 1 applied to the polynomial system induced by equality

$$\phi(A_1,\ B_1,\ k_1,\ k_2,\ k_3) = \phi(\tilde{A}_1,\ \tilde{B}_1,\ \tilde{k}_1,\ \tilde{k}_2,\ \tilde{k}_3)$$

and the set C returns the relative identifiability tree composed of 11 branches:

$$\begin{array}{lll}\mathcal{T} = \{ & [A_1, B_1, \overline{k_1}, k_2, k_3, m_1, m_2], & [A_1, B_1, \overline{k_2}, k_1, k_3, m_1, m_2], \\ & [A_1, B_1, \overline{k_3}, k_1, k_2, m_1, m_2], & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_1}, \overline{k_1}, k_2, k_3, m_2], \\ & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_1}, \overline{k_2}, k_1, k_3, m_2], & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_1}, \overline{k_3}, k_1, k_2, m_2], \\ & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_1}, \overline{m_2}, k_1, k_2, k_3], & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_2}, \overline{k_1}, k_2, k_3, m_1], \\ & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_2}, \overline{k_2}, k_1, k_3, m_1], & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_2}, \overline{k_3}, k_1, k_2, m_1], \\ & & [A_1, B_1, \overline{m_2}, \overline{m_1}, k_1, k_2, k_3] \quad \}\end{array}$$

The first branch appearing in $\mathcal{T}$ shows that all the parameters k_2, k_3, m_1 and m_2 are identifiable relatively to k_1 (see Proposition 8). In other words, the outputs and an estimation of k_1 are sufficient to have the identifiability of the model.

In the same way, the second (respectively the third) branch returned by Algorithm 1 shows that System (9) is identifiable when the experimenter has an estimation of k_2 (respectively k_3).

More generally, the tree $\mathcal{T}$ shows that the experimenter needs to estimate:

- at least one of the three spring stiffness k_1, k_2, k_3 or
- the two masses m_1 and m_2,

to be insured that all the parameters are identifiable.

A possible application of our algorithm is in diagnosability and detectability of parameter faults appearing in a system. Diagnosability is the property of a system that insures that the faults can be discriminated using the available sensors. In [21], the authors propose new definitions of these notions named *functional diagnosability* and *functional detectability*. They are based on fault signatures formed from the input-output polynomials obtained at Section 2. They prove that if, from these polynomials, the parameters are identifiable, the polynomials will have different numerical behaviors according to the identifiable parameter whose value change. In our application, the experimenter may be interested only in detecting any decrease of spring forces from the outputs. In this case, he will focus on the identifiability of k_1, k_2 and k_3. From the identifiability tree $\mathcal{T}$, either he must know the two masses or one of the spring. Under these conditions, he can use the input-output polynomials as a signature to detect a change in the value of one of the spring.

4.2 Lotka-Volterra model with two species

In this aplication, we consider the classical Lotka-Volterra model with two species. This model can describe cooperation and also competition of these 2 species. The differential system of this model is:

$$\begin{cases} x_1' = r_1 x_1 \left(1 - \dfrac{x_1 + \alpha_{12} x_2}{K_1}\right) \\ x_2' = r_2 x_2 \left(1 - \dfrac{x_2 + \alpha_{21} x_1}{K_2}\right) \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where

- x_1 (resp. x_2) represents the population of specie 1 (resp. 2);
- K_1 (resp. K_2) is the carrying capacity of specie 1 (resp. 2);
- r_1 (resp. r_2) is the inherent per-capita growth rate of specie 1 (resp. 2);
- α_{12} (resp. α_{21}) is the effect of species 1 (resp. 2) on the population of species 2 (resp. 1).

In this application, we suppose that the measured variable is x_1, that the parameters K_1 and r_1 are known and that any of the model's parameters is equal to 0. The unknown parameters are then the specific parameters of species 2, r_2, K_2, and the parameters corresponding to the interaction of the two species, α_{12} and α_{21}.

In order to study the relative identifiability of System (11), we first apply the Rosenfeld-Groebner algorithm with the elimination order induced by

$$[r_1, r_2, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{21}, K_1, K_2] \prec [x_1] \prec [x_2].$$

After dividing the output of this algorithm by $K_1 K_2 \alpha_{12} r_1$, this leads to the differential equation linking the output x_1 and the parameters $\{r_1, r_2, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{21}, K_1, K_2\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & x_1\, x_1'' + \left(\tfrac{a_{21}\, r_2}{K_2} + \tfrac{r_1}{K_1} - 2\,\tfrac{r_2}{K_2\, a_{12}}\right) {x_1}^2 x_1' - \left(r_2 - 2\,\tfrac{r_2\, K_1}{K_2\, a_{12}}\right) x_1\, x_1' - \left(1 + \tfrac{r_2\, K_1}{K_2\, a_{12}\, r_1}\right) {x_1'}^2 \\ & + \left(\tfrac{r_1\, r_2}{K_1\, K_2\, a_{12}} - \tfrac{r_1\, a_{21}\, r_2}{K_1\, K_2}\right) {x_1}^4 - \left(\tfrac{r_1\, a_{21}\, r_2}{K_2} + \tfrac{r_1\, r_2}{K_1} - 2\,\tfrac{r_1\, r_2}{K_2\, a_{12}}\right) {x_1}^3 \\ & + \left(\tfrac{K_1\, r_1\, r_2}{K_2\, a_{12}} - r_1\, r_2\right) {x_1}^2 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

From this equation, we obtain the exhaustive summary and the function ϕ, defined in Section 2.

The natural signification of the parameters and the assumption that K_1 and r_1 are known leads to the set of conditions

$$C = \{r_1 > 0, r_2 > 0, K_1 > 0, K_2 > 0, \tilde{r}_1 > 0, \tilde{r}_2 > 0, \tilde{K}_1 > 0, \tilde{K}_2 > 0, \tilde{r}_1 = r_1,\ \tilde{K}_1 = K_1\}\,.$$

With this set of conditions, Algorithm 1 returns an identifiability tree composed of the 18 following branches:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{[K_1, r_1, \overline{K_2}, a_{12}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{r_2}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{K_2}, a_{12}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{21}}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{K_2}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{r_2}], \\ & [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{K_2}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{21}}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{K_2}, \overline{r_2}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{K_2}], \\ & [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{K_2}, \overline{a_{21}}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{K_2}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{K_2}, a_{12}, \overline{r_2}], \end{aligned}$$

$$[K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{K_2}, \overline{r_2}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{K_2}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{K_2}, a_{12}],$$
$$[K_1, r_1, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{K_2}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{r_2}, \overline{K_2}, a_{12}, \overline{a_{21}}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{K_2}, \overline{a_{21}}],$$
$$[K_1, r_1, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{K_2}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{K_2}, a_{12}], [K_1, r_1, \overline{r_2}, \overline{a_{21}}, \overline{a_{12}}, \overline{K_2}]\}.$$

This output indicates that, even if K_1 and r_1 are known, System (11) has no identifiable parameters.

Let us focus on the effect of additional informations.

Assume that the experimenter knows that the two species are in a situation of competition. In this case, the parameters α_{12} and α_{21} are non negative and we can add to C the two inequalities $\alpha_{12} > 0$ and $\tilde{\alpha_{12}} > 0$. The identifiability tree is then composed of 3 branch

$$\{[K_1, r_1, r_2, \overline{K_2}, a_{12}, a_{21}], [K_1, r_1, r_2, \overline{a_{12}}, K_2, a_{21}], [K_1, r_1, r_2, \overline{a_{21}}, K_2, a_{12}]\}.$$

Consequently, the unknown parameters $K_2, \alpha_{12}, \alpha_{21}$ are not identifiable and, if one of these parameters is identifiable, the system is entirely identifiable.

In addition to the last assumption, initial conditions can be taken into account. Assume initial conditions $x_1(0) > 0$ and $x_2(0) > 0$ known, System (11) gives four algebraic equalities

$$\begin{cases} x_1'(0)K_1 - r_1x_1(0)\left(K_1 - x_1(0) - \alpha_{12}x_2(0)\right) = 0 \\ x_2'(0)K_2 - r_2x_2(0)\left(K_2 - x_2(0) - \alpha_{21}x_1(0)\right) = 0 \\ x_1'(0)\tilde{K_1} - \tilde{r_1}x_1(0)\left(\tilde{K_1} - x_1(0) - \tilde{\alpha_{12}}x_2(0)\right) = 0 \\ x_2'(0)\tilde{K_2} - \tilde{r_2}x_2(0)\left(\tilde{K_2} - x_2(0) - \tilde{\alpha_{21}}x_1(0)\right) = 0 \end{cases}$$

which can be added to the set C of conditions satisfied by Θ and $\tilde{\Theta}$.

With these new conditions, Algorithm 1 insures that all the parameters are identifiable, in other words, System (11) is identifiable.

4.3 Chikungunya model

The following model is an epidemiological model describing the propagation of the Chikungunya disease to human population, it had been developed by [14]. In [24], an identifiability study had been done on this model.

$$S \quad \begin{cases} S_1 \begin{cases} E'(t) = bA(t)\left(1 - \dfrac{E(t)}{K_E}\right) - (s+d)E(t) \\ L'(t) = sE(t)\left(1 - \dfrac{L(t)}{K_L}\right) - (s_L + d_L)L(t) \\ A'(t) = s_L L(t) - d_m A(t) \end{cases} \\ \\ S_2 \begin{cases} S'_H(t) = -\left(b_H + \beta_H I_m(t)\right) S_H(t) + b_H \\ I'_H(t) = \beta_H I_m(t) S_H(t) - (\gamma + b_H) I_H(t) \\ I'_m(t) = -\left(s_L \dfrac{L(t)}{A(t)} + \beta_m I_H(t)\right) I_m(t) + \beta_m I_H(t) \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

Let us explain briefly this system. Equations appearing in S_1 correspond to the three biological steps in the life cycle of the mosquito transmitting the disease : E is the number of eggs, L the number of pupae and E the number of adult females. Assuming that the number of larvae can be counted weeks by weeks by biologists, this variable is considered as one of the measured variable of the model. Functions appearing in System S_2 describes the evolution of the rate S_H of humans susceptible to be infected, the rate I_H of infected humans and the rate I_M of infected mosquitoes. In S_2, S_H and I_H can be supposed to be measured variables. In [24], the authors suppose that a part of the parameters is known to do the identifiability study. In this paper, we propose to study the (relative-)identifiability relatively to any sets of parameters of the model. Thus, unknown parameters of System S are

- b is the intrinsic rate of eggs, s (resp. s_L) is the transfer rate from E to L (resp. from L to A);
- K_E (resp. K_L) is the carrying capacity of E (resp. carrying capacity of L);
- d, d_L and d_M are the rates of natural deaths for eggs, larvae and adults;
- b_H the human birth,
- γ is the transfer rate between infected humans and recovered humans;
- β_H (resp. β_M) is the infectious contact rate between susceptible humans and vectors (resp. susceptible mosquitoes and humans).

Naturally, real parameters of System S are supposed to be non negative which leads to set $C = \{b_H > 0, \beta_H > 0, \gamma > 0, s_L > 0, \beta_M > 0, d > 0, d_L > 0, d_M > 0, b > 0, s > 0, K_E > 0, K_L > 0, b_H > 0, \tilde{\beta}_H > 0, \tilde{\gamma}' > 0, \tilde{s}_L > 0, \tilde{\beta}_M > 0, \tilde{d} > 0, \tilde{d}_L > 0, \tilde{d}_M > 0, \tilde{b} > 0, \tilde{s} > 0, \tilde{K}_E > 0, \tilde{K}_L > 0\}$.

As in [24], we suppose that I_H, S_H and L are the measured variables. In order to apply the Rosenfeld-Grobner algorithm to system S, the last

equation of S is multiplied by $A(t)$. This algorithm used with the elimination order induced by

$$[K_E, K_L, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_m, d_L, d_m, \gamma, b, d, s, s_L] \prec [S_H, I_H, L] \prec [I_M, E, A]$$

returns three differential equations linking unknown parameters and functions I_H, S_H, L. One of these equation does not have a constant coefficient c_{ij} and therefore its coefficients can not be estimated uniquely up to a multiplicative constant from experimental values. This equation have to be divided by one of these coefficients: $K_E K_L$ is used in this application (See Section 4.2 for a similar situation). From these equations, we obtain an exhaustive summary containing the 694 coefficients of the latter three differential equations. This exhaustive summary can be reduced to 212 coefficients not differing by a multiplicative constant.

Algorithm 1 applied to the system obtained from C and function ϕ returns the following set of branches:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\{[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{K}_e, d, s, \bar{b}, d_l, s_l], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{K}_e, d, s, \bar{d}_l, b, s_l], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{K}_e, d, s, \bar{s}_l, b, d_l], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{b}, \bar{K}_e, d, d_l, s, s_l], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{b}, \bar{d}, K_e, d_l, s, s_l], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{b}, \bar{d}_l, K_e, d, s, s_l], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{b}, \bar{s}, K_e, d, d_l, s_l], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{b}, \bar{s}_l, K_e, d, d_l, s], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{d}, K_e, s, \bar{b}, d_l, s_l], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{d}, K_e, s, \bar{d}_l, b, s_l], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{d}, K_e, s, \bar{s}_l, b, d_l], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{d}_l, sl, \bar{K}_e, b, d, s], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{d}_l, s_l, \bar{b}, K_e, d, s], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{d}_l, s_l, \bar{d}, K_e, b, s], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{d}_l, s_l, \bar{s}, K_e, b, d], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{s}, K_e, d, \bar{b}, d_l, s_l], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{s}, K_e, d, \bar{d}_l, b, s_l], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{s}, K_e, d, \bar{s}_l, b, d_l], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{s}_l, d_l, \bar{K}_e, b, d, s], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{s}_l, d_l, \bar{b}, K_e, d, s], \\
[K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{s}_l, d_l, \bar{d}, K_e, b, s], & [K_l, b_H, \beta_H, \beta_M, d_m, g, \bar{s}_l, d_l, \bar{s}, K_e, b, d]\}
\end{array}$$

This output shows that $K_E, K_L, b_H, d, d_m, \gamma, s$ are identifiable. In order to identify the whole system, this result indicates that two other parameters have to be estimated.

5 Conclusion

The introduction of *relative identifiability* definition permits to elaborate strategies for studying parameters identifiability of nonlinear models. The proposed algorithm does not require any experimental data of inputs and outputs and gives a mean for studying *a priori* relative identifiability of unknown parameters of differential models. This method enables the user to take into account inequalities satisfied by parameters to study their identifiability.

This method is composed of two steps. The first one consists in the determination of algebraic relations between the outputs, the inputs and the

unknown parameters by a classical elimination method used in differential algebra. The second step consists in using the algorithm proposed in this paper in order to determine the identifiability of any parameter relatively to any set of other parameters by testing emptiness of semi algebraic sets. In particular, the output of this algorithm can be used to determine which parameters must be known to make the whole system identifiable.

6 Thanks

The authors thank Mohab Safey El Din and Lilianne Denis Vidal for their help and their encouragements.

References

[1] S. Audoly, G. Bellu, L. D'Angio, M. P. Saccomani, and C. Cobelli. Global identifiability of nonlinear models of biological systems. *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, 48:55–65, 2001.

[2] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie-Françoise Roy. *Algorithms in Real Algebraic Geometry (Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics)*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 2006.

[3] G. Bellu, M. Pia Saccomanil, S. Audoly, and L. D'Angi. Daisy: A new software tool to test global identifiability of biological and physiological systems. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 28 (1):52–61, 2007.

[4] Christopher W. Brown. Qepcad b: A program for computing with semi-algebraic sets using cads. *SIGSAM BULLETIN*, 37:97–108, 2003.

[5] M.J. Chapman, K.R. Godfrey, M.J. Chappell, and N.D. Evans. Structural identifiability of nonlinear systems using linear/nonlinear splitting. *Int. J. Control*, 76:209–216, 2003.

[6] M.J. Chappell and K.R. Godfrey. Structural identifiability of the parameters of a nonlinear batch reactor model. *Math. Biosci*, 108:245–251, 1992.

[7] L. Denis-Vidal and G. Joly-Blanchard. Equivalence an identifiability analysis of uncontrolled nonlinear dynamical systems. *Automatica*, 40:287–292, 2004.

[8] L. Denis-Vidal, G. Joly-Blanchard, and C. Noiret. Some effective approaches to check identifiability of uncontrolled nonlinear systems. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 57:35–44, 2001.

[9] L. Denis-Vidal, G. Joly-Blanchard, C. Noiret, and M. Petitot. An algorithm to test identifiability of non-linear systems. In *Proceedings of 5th IFAC NOLCOS*, volume 7, pages 174–178, St Petersburg, Russia, 2001.

[10] M. Diop and M. Fliess. Nonlinear observabiliy, identifiability and persistant trajectories. In *Proc. 30th CDC*, pages 714–719, Brighton, UK, 1991.

[11] M.S. El Din. Raglib: A library for real solving polynomial systems of equa-
tions and inequalities. 2007.

[12] M. Fliess and T. Glad. An algebraic approach to linear and nonlinear control. In *Essays on control: perspectives in the theory and it application*, volume 7, pages 223–267, Cambridge, MA, Birkhauser, 1993.

[13] L. Ljung and T. Glad. On global identifiability for arbitrary model parametrizations. *Automatica*, 30:265–276, 1994.

[14] D. Moulay, M.A. Aziz-Alaoui, and M. Cadivel. The chikungunya disease: Modeling, vector and transmission global dynamics. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 229(1):50 – 63, 2011.

[15] F. Ollivier. Identifiabilité des systèmes. In *Technical Report*, 97-04, GAGE, Ecole polytechnique, 1997.

[16] H. Pohjanpalo. System identifiability based on the power series expansion of the solution. *Math. Biosciences*, 41:21–33, 1978.

[17] J. L. Rabinowitsch. Zum Hilbertschen Nullstellensatz. *Math. Ann.*, 102(1):520, 1930.

[18] M.P. Saccomani, S. Audoly, and L. D'Angio. Parameter identifiability of nonlinear systems: the role of initial conditions. *Automatica*, 39:619–632, 2004.

[19] M. Pia Saccomanil, S. Audoly, G. Bellu, and L. D'Angi. Examples of testing global identifiability of biological and biomedical models with the daisy software. *Journal Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 40 (4):402–407, 2010.

[20] N. Verdière, L. Denis-Vidal, G. Joly-Blanchard, and D. Domurado. Identifiability and estimation of pharmacokinetic parameters for the ligands of the macrophage mannose receptor. *Int. J. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci.*, 15:517–526, 2005.

[21] N. Verdière, C. Jauberthie, and Louise Travé-Massuy es. Functional diagnosability and detectability of nonlinear models based on analytical redundancy relations. *Journal of Process Control*, 35, 2015.

[22] E. Walter and Y. Lecourtier. Global approaches to identifiability testing for linear and nonlinear state space models. *Math. and Comput.in Simul.*, 24:472–482, 1982.

[23] Bican Xia. Discoverer: A tool for solving semi-algebraic systems. *ACM Commun. Comput. Algebra*, 41(3):102–103, September 2007.

[24] N. Verdière Z. Shousheng, L. Denis-Vidal. Identifiabilitys study in a model describing the propagation of the chikungunya to the human population. In *MOSIM 2014*, Nancy,France, 5-7 November, 2014.